REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated October 27, 2008, and the Advisory Action dated February 9, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. A petition for a one-month extension of time and a request for continued examination (RCE) accompany this Amendment. Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 9-12 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0006279, hereafter "Saeki") in view of Asami (U.S. Patent No. 6,036,100, hereafter "Asami"). Additionally, in the Advisory Action, the Examiner suggested that the Applicants clarify the claims regarding the block size setting and the information on the block size to help further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art.

Accordingly, the Applicants amended independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14, as suggested by the Examiner. More specifically, independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 have been amended such that the phrase "the information about the block size" is replaced with the phrase "the information specifying the block size." Additionally, the phrase "the response corresponding to the block size setting command" is replaced with the phrase "the response acknowledging receipt of the block size setting command." For example, claim 1, as amended, recites the following features:

"[a]n electronic apparatus comprising:

an interface section that communicates with a host device through a command/response line and a data line, wherein:

a command and a response are transmitted through the command/response line, and data is transmitted through the data line;

the command, the response and the data are transmitted in this order between the electronic apparatus and the host device;

the transmitted data is divided into data blocks with a block size specified by the host device when a length of the data is at least a predetermined length; and

8

the interface section receives, via the command/response line, a block size setting command which informs the electronic apparatus of transmitting information specifying the block size, transmits a response acknowledging receipt of the block size setting command via the command/response line, and then receives the information specifying the block size via the data line;

a storage section that stores the received information specifying the block size; and

a data buffer that stores data, wherein

when the specified block size is larger than a capacity of the data buffer, the interface section includes error information about an inability of accepting data blocks of the specified block size in a response acknowledging receipt of a command different from the block size setting command, and transmits the response including the error information to the host device."

The features noted above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 6, 9 and 14 (as amended).

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14) is distinguishable over the cited prior art in that information specifying the block size is transmitted as data separately from the command. Additionally, error information about an inability of accepting a data block of the specified size is included in a response to a command that is different from the block size setting command, and is transmitted to the host. No such features are believed to be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relied on Saeki in view of Asami for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14. The Applicants assert that Saeki in view of Asami fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14, as amended.

Saeki discloses that data is divided into a predetermined block size of data blocks and is transmitted. However, in the present invention, the information on the block size is transmitted separately from the command. Saeki fails to disclose or suggest that information on the block size is transmitted as data separately from the command.

Moreover, Asami fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Saeki. Asami merely discloses that error information is sent back when there is an error in data. Asami also fails to disclose or suggest that information on the block size is transmitted as data separately from the command.

9

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Saeki and Asami would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14. Likewise, no combination of Saeki and Asami would result in, or otherwise render obvious claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15 and 16 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Seiji NAKAMURA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/

By: 2009.02.27 13:24:48 -05'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 27, 2009